



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,987	11/21/2001	Risto Kivipuro	460-010723-US(PAR)	3443
2512	7590	01/25/2008		
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			EXAMINER WINTER, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/990,987	Applicant(s) KIVIPURO ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN M. WINTER	Art Unit 3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14, 16-25 and 33-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14, 16-25 and 33-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114

1. A request for continued examination ("RCE") under 37 C.F.R. §1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 31, 2007 has been entered.

Acknowledgements

2. In accordance with the RCE noted above, Applicants' amendment filed on October 31, 2007 is acknowledged.
3. Accordingly, claims 2-14, 16-25 and 33-45 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-14, 16-25 and 33-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kaydyk et al (6,209,111) in view of either Ginter et al (U.S. 5,892,900) or Watanabe et al (U.S. 6,084,888).

Art Unit: 3621

6. Regarding claim 35, Kaydyk et al (See Figs. 7 and 11, Col. 1, lines 45-65, Col. 9, lines 50-65,) disclose a method for associating content with a data structure (header) in a wireless communication device substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit data structure definition. It is noted that the claim appears to read on all wireless packets with headers. It is further noted that metadata describes or defines other data and is normally present as a constituent of complex header data. Each of Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15- 40) or Watanabe et al (See Fig. 5-7, 11-12 and claims 1-11) show packets with complex headers in a wireless environment including metadata. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Kaydyk et al because packet headers are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations; furthermore the combination of these elements does not alter their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

7. Official Notice is taken that “a device specific content packet“ is common and well known in prior art in reference to network protocols. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a device specific content packet in order to authenticate the client device. The Examiner notes that this feature is commonly used by any system utilizing a network with a digitally signed packets, commonly used in secure networks and content distribution systems. See *e.g.* Yianolos et. al. (U.S. 2001/0056533) for a typical implementation of such a system.

Art Unit: 3621

8. Regarding the data limitations of claim 2, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) or watanabe et al (see Fig. 5-7, 11-12 and claims 1-11) show packets with complex headers in a wireless environment that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

9. Official Notice is taken that “a device specific content packet“ is common and well known in prior art in reference to network protocols. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a device specific content packet in order to authenticate the client device. The Examiner notes that this feature is commonly used by any system utilizing a network with a digitally signed, commonly used in secure networks and content distribution systems. See *e.g.* Yianolos.

10. Xlaims 35, 36, 43 and 44 are in parallel with claim 35 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

11. Regarding server limitations of claim 3, Kaydyk et al (See elements 12 or 16) disclose web server equivalents that are conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

12. Regarding storage limitations of claim 4, Kaydyk et al (See elements 59 and 61) disclose storage that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

13. Regarding the separate storage limitations of claim 5, Kaydyk et al (See Figs. 7 and 11, Col. 1, lines 45-65, Col. 9, lines 50-65,) disclose a method for associating content with a separate data structure (header) in a wireless communication device that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

14. Regarding definition limitations of claim 6, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

15. Regarding charge limitations of claim 7, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes usage charge that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.
16. Regarding protection limitations of claim 8, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes copy protection that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.
17. Regarding the encryption limitations of claim 9, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes encryption that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.
18. Regarding content limitations of claim 10, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26- 30) show multimedia content definition within a complex packet header that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.
19. Regarding executable limitations of claim 11, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet-header that includes executable code that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.
20. Regarding storage limitations of claim 12, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes storage definition that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.
21. Regarding classification limitations of claim 13 Ginter et. al. (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes multimedia data classified by type that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

22. Regarding information limitations of claim 14, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes new data that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

23. Regarding the data limitations of claim 16, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26- 30) or Watanabe et al (See Fig. 5-7, 11-12 and claims 1-11) show packets with complex headers in a wireless environment that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

24. Regarding server limitations of claim 17, Kaydyk et al (See elements 12 or 16) disclose web server equivalents that are conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

25. Regarding the separate storage limitations of claim 18, Kaydyk et al (See Figs. 7 and 11, Col. i, lines 45-65, Col. 9, lines 50- 65,) disclose a method for associating content with a separate data structure (header) in a wireless communication device that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

26. Regarding version limitations of claim 19, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show different content definition within a complex packet header that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

27. Regarding definition limitations of claim 20, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

28. Regarding charge limitations of claim 21, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26- 30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes usage charge that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

Art Unit: 3621

29. Regarding protection limitations of claim 22, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes copy protection that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

30. Regarding the encryption limitations of claim 23, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes encryption that are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

31. Regarding classification limitations of claim 24 Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes multimedia data classified by type that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

32. Regarding searching limitations of claim 25, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes pointers that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

33. Regarding claim 33, Kaydyk et al (See Figs. 7 and ii, Col. i, lines 45-65, Col. 9, lines 50-65,) disclose a method for associating content with a data structure (header) in a wireless communication device substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is the use of explicit data structure definition. It is noted that the claim appears to read on all wireless packets with headers. It is further noted that metadata describes or defines other data and is normally present as a constituent of complex header data. Each of Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15-40) or Watanabe et al (See Fig. 5-7, 11-12 and claims 1-11) show packets with complex headers in a wireless environment including metadata and storage. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Kaydyk et al because packet headers are conventional functional

equivalents of the claim limitations.

Official Notice is taken that “examining the data structure of the content packet to identify download properties of the content packet and compatibility of the at least one content component with the wireless device; selecting at least one content component which said examining indicated is compatible with the wireless device;” is common and well known in prior art in reference to network protocols (Examiner notes that the term “data structure” is construed as including a digital certificate). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a device specific content packet in order to authenticate the client device. The Examiner notes that this feature is commonly used by any system utilizing a network with a digitally signed packets, commonly used in secure networks and content distribution systems. See *e.g.* Yianolos for a typical implementation.

34. Regarding selection limitations of claim 36, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15-40) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes metadata and multimedia data classified by type that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

35. Regarding content limitations of claims 37-42, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15-40) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes metadata, content descriptors, and multimedia data classified by type that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

36. Regarding claim 43, Kaydyk et al (See Figs. 7 and 11, Col. 1, lines 45-65, Col. 9, lines 50-65,) disclose a means for associating content with a data structure (header) in a wireless communication device substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the

Art Unit: 3621

claimed invention is the use of explicit data structure definition. It is noted that the claim appears to read on all wireless packets with headers. It is further noted that metadata describes or defines other data and is normally present as a constituent of complex header data. Each of Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15- 40) or Watanabe et al (See Fig. 5-7, 11-12 and claims i-ii) show packets with complex headers in a wireless environment including metadata. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Kaydyk et al because packet headers are conventional functional equivalents of the claim limitations.

37. Regarding claim 44, Ginter et al (See Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15-40) show content definition within a complex packet header that includes metadata and multimedia data classified by type that is conventional functional equivalent of the claim limitations.

38. Regarding claim 45, Ginter et al (See Abstract, Figs 5b, 17, 20, 26-30, Col. 284, lines 15-40) shows wherein each content component comprises a media presentation.

Response to Arguments

39. The Applicants arguments filed on October 31, 2007 have been fully considered.

40. The Applicant states that the prior art record fails to disclose the claimed feature of "device specific content packet".

41. The Examiner states that that this feature is commonly used by any system utilizing a network with a digitally signed packets, commonly used in secure networks and content distribution systems; a device could utilize a public key or digital certificate to "sign" data

Art Unit: 3621

packets, when received these packets would only be able to be authenticated by a device with the proper corresponding key etc.. (i.e. device specific content packet).

Conclusion

42. Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

43. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John M. Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6, 1st Fridays off.

44. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

45. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

Art Unit: 3621

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Winter/
Examiner, Art Unit 3621

/Andrew J. Fischer/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3621